

GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, RITCHIE & DAY, LLP
 ROBERT A. GOODIN, State Bar No. 061302
 FRANCINE T. RADFORD, State Bar No. 168269
 KEITH E. JOHNSON, State Bar No. 202321
 505 Sansome Street, Suite 900
 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 392-7900
 Facsimile: (415) 398-4321

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
 THOMAS V. LORAN III, State Bar No. 95255
 JOANNE H. KIM, State Bar No. 221525
 50 Fremont Street
 Post Office Box 7880
 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
 Telephone: (415) 983-1000
 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Common Sense Media

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

VIDEO SOFTWARE DEALERS and
 ENTERTAINMENT SOFTWARE
 ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his
 official capacity as Governor of the State of
 California; BILL LOCKYER, in his official
 capacity as Attorney General of the State of
 California; GEORGE KENNEDY, in his
 official capacity as Santa Clara County
 District Attorney; RICHARD DOYLE, in his
 official capacity as City Attorney for the City
 of San Jose, and ANN MILLER RAVEL, in
 her official capacity as County Counsel for
 the County of Santa Clara.

Defendants.

No. C 05 4188 RMW RS

**OPPOSITION OF AMICUS CURIAE
 COMMON SENSE MEDIA TO
 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO STRIKE**

Date: May 12, 2006

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 6

Before the Honorable Ronald M. Whyte

Case No. C 05 4188 RMW RS

Opposition of Amicus Curiae Common Sense Media to Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike

1 In their Motion to Strike The Brief of Amicus Curiae Common Sense Media
2 (“Plfs. Mot.”), plaintiffs acknowledge that the court’s order of March 6, 2006 granting leave for
3 Common Sense Media (“CSM”) to participate in this action was based on CSM’s request to the
4 court to provide information in connection with the planned summary judgment motions. See
5 Plfs. Mot., page 1, lines 15-16. Plaintiffs now complain that in lieu of “information,” CSM
6 submitted evidence in the form of expert testimony. Plaintiffs assert that CSM’s submission of
7 evidence – as opposed to “information” -- is improper.

8 The court’s order, however, was grounded on the notion that CSM’s participation
9 should be useful to the court. The only form of information that is of use to the court is the
10 species of information known as evidence. S. A. Empresa de Viacao Aerea Rio Grandense
11 (Varig Airlines) v. Walter Kidde & Co., 690 F.2d 1235, 1238 (9th Cir. 1982) (“[A] party cannot
12 manufacture a genuine issue of material fact merely by making assertions in its legal
13 memoranda”). See also N.D. Cal. Local Rule 7-5. (“Affidavit or Declaration. (a) Affidavit or
14 Declaration Required. Factual contentions made in support of or in opposition to any motion must
15 be supported by an affidavit or declaration and by appropriate references to the record.”) Thus,
16 CSM appropriately submitted expert declarations containing testimony concerning an issue raised
17 by plaintiffs in their moving papers: whether or not the record reviewed by the legislature was in
18 fact consistent with and supported by the general body of scientific knowledge in the relevant
19 area. Providing this evidence was entirely consistent with the court’s directive to CSM.¹

20 Plaintiffs also complain that CSM violated the court’s order that asked CSM to
21 refrain from duplicating the work of the other defendants. CMS supposedly did this by
22 submitting expert testimony that the State did not offer in connection with these motions.
23 Plaintiffs illogically assert that CSM “duplicated” something that the State “could just as easily
24 offered, but decided not to submit in this case.” Plfs. Mot., p. 2, lines 23-24. Plaintiffs’
25 contention makes no sense: offering evidence that the State did *not* offer cannot constitute

26 _____
27 ¹ That CSM is taking a stance on the issue before the court is not improper. See NGV Gaming,
28 Ltd. v. Upstream Point Molate, LLC, 355 F. Supp. 2d 1061, 1068 (N.D. Cal. 2005) (noting that
“amicus with partisan interests are now quite common” in litigation).

1 improper duplication of the State's efforts.²

2 Plaintiffs' cases do not support their position that it is *per se* improper for an
3 amicus to submit declaration testimony. In Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School Dist., the court
4 struck a *trial brief* filed by the "Discovery Institute," an organization that had neither sought nor
5 been granted amicus status. The brief improperly attempted to sponsor testimony by persons who
6 had been designated as expert witnesses by the defendants, but who were subsequently withdrawn
7 so that they could not be cross-examined at deposition or trial. Allowing their declaration
8 testimony under such circumstances would be "fundamentally unfair," as the court ruled.
9 Similarly, in Federal Trade Comm'n v. Staples, Inc. 970 F. Supp. 1066, 1070 (D.D.C. 1997), an
10 amicus attempted to submit a declaration from a new witness *after* a five-day evidentiary hearing
11 at which numerous other witnesses testified. In contrast, declaration testimony submitted in
12 support of, or in opposition to, a motion for summary judgment motion is entirely proper. Fed.
13 Rule Civ. Proc. rule 56.

14 CONCLUSION

15 The concise submission by CSM in support of defendants' opposition to plaintiffs'
16 motion for summary judgment, consisting of a 5 page brief and 25 pages of declaration testimony
17 plus supporting exhibits, did not violate the court's order of March 6, 2006, and plaintiffs' motion
18 to strike should be denied.

19 Dated: May 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI,
RITCHIE & DAY, LLP

By /s/Francine T. Radford

Francine T. Radford
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Common Sense Media

20
21
22
23
24
25 ² Plaintiffs also argue that the State "could have just as easily offered" the testimony that CSM submitted.
26 It was CSM, not the State, that had the resources to identify and obtain testimony from these particular
27 experts (who are extraordinarily well-qualified to testify on the issues at hand) because of CSM's own
28 work in educating the public about the impact of media on youth. The State, unlike plaintiffs, limited its
analysis to materials in the legislative record. If, however, it is somehow more "proper" for the State to
introduce the expert declarations than for CSM to do so (as the plaintiffs appear to suggest) CSM believes
that the State would be willing to do so.